

Tom Manton was a political boss. He was the head of a machine. But he gave new meaning to the word machine and being a boss. A conciliator, a mediator, a guy who made things happen as he took this diverse, rapidly growing borough; rapidly growing in terms of diverse population, and he wove it all together without bitter fights and without leaving a lot of blood in the aisles.

So I take my hat off to Tom Manton and the kind of example he set. Several of my colleagues have said that Tom embodied "the American dream." Yes, he did. But the totality of his achievements cannot be contained in even that sought-after tribute. This ordinary American with his extraordinary ability to appeal to the best parts of human nature gifted Ireland, the land of his ancestors, with a lasting peace by facilitating the Good Friday Accords. Throughout his life Tom encouraged political solutions to contentious issues—not violence, fear or isolation.

Tom Manton fought hard for his constituents, often greasing the wheels of the bureaucracy to help them out. Elected officials and public leaders also received his invaluable support and guidance. He shared a workingman's outlook because he was a workingman: a policeman, a salesman, and Marine. He cared for the environment and recognized that protecting the air and water would protect communities. He was a thinker and a far-sighted activist for a better world.

In Tom's sensible hands, politics might be partisan, but could never be called "dirty." In his capable hands, the New Yorkers who unfailingly voted him into Congress were confident of fair thoughtful representation. They knew—regardless of race, gender, or background—they were welcome at any table where he presided. He had a beautiful vision of what a community should be, a party, a country, a world. He was a loyal friend to many and a much-loved family man. He will be missed, but his life and his contributions will not be forgotten.

#### HONORING ROSEMARY FOREMAN IN RETIREMENT

#### HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, August 2, 2006*

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rosemary Foreman, who is retiring after contributing over thirty years of service to the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Republican Party. I have known Rosemary Foreman since my days in the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors when she was a congressional staffer for Congressman Stan Par- ris.

Rosemary served as the first Community/ Outreach Coordinator for the Virginia Attorney General Office's Northern Virginia Regional Office, under Attorneys General Bob McDonnell, Jim Gilmore, Mark Earley, Jerry Kilgore, as well as interim Attorneys General Randy Baeles and Richard Cullen.

In this position, Rosemary leveraged her considerable interpersonal and communications skills to help the Attorney General educate the citizens of Northern Virginia on consumer protection and crime prevention.

Before joining the government of Virginia, Rosemary helped lead a number of political campaigns for state and congressional candidates in Northern Virginia and held political positions in several Congressional offices. Throughout her career, she earned a well-deserved reputation for her political acumen, tenacious advocacy and gracious constituent service.

In the course of developing a valued and impressive record of public and political service, Rosemary was a dedicated and loving wife to her husband E. David Foreman, Jr., and mother to her two children, Sheryl Olecheck and E. David Foreman III.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Rosemary Foreman and congratulating her on her retirement after a distinguished career dedicated to serving the citizens of Northern Virginia.

#### UNITED STATES AND INDIA NU- CLEAR COOPERATION PRO- MOTION ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

#### HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 26, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5682) to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 a proposed nuclear agreement for cooperation with India:

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concerns with the United States and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act of 2006, H.R. 5682. While I intend to vote in support of this legislation, I do so with serious concerns that must be articulated to the Administration.

The President and the State Department failed to seriously consult with Congress prior to announcing this proposed partnership, and therefore left little room for Congress to either voice concern or make any substantial change to the proposed partnership. Without any serious Congressional discussions on the issue, the Administration felt it acceptable to announce last July that it would seek to bypass the global nonproliferation regime that has served to provide international security for decades. The White House's tacit acknowledgement that such a proposition would require legislative approval once again shows how this Administration lacks any respect for the balance of powers enumerated in Constitution, and the principle that Congress is an equal branch of government.

In the face of this serious lapse of judgment on the part of the Administration, the Committee on International Relations should be commended for its bipartisan work undertaken to strengthen this legislation, and improve upon the poor proposal the Administration originally proposed. Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS took the serious concerns expressed by many members, both those on the Committee and those not, into consideration to drastically improve the bill now before us, guaranteeing Congress the right to see the agreement prior to final Congressional approval. In addition, India will

open its civilian nuclear facilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency for inspections, and should India perform any weapons tests in the future, all U.S. cooperation would cease, permanently. India must work with the U.S. to conclude a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty as well.

The overarching goal of this legislation, to increase positive diplomatic ties between the U.S. and India, is laudable. India is the world's largest democracy, and is a growing economic and political influence not only in Southeast Asia, but in the greater global community. There is bipartisan agreement that India is a friendly and growing partner of the U.S. in many respects. When India reached out to the United States in the 1960s, seeking partnership and increased friendly relations with us, we rebuffed them. It was a mistake to do so then, and it would be a mistake to do so now and allow an opportunity to warm relations with India to slip by.

However, I have serious concerns that prior to any civil nuclear agreement can move forward, safeguards be in place to ensure that India does not use any of this technology to further its production of nuclear weapons. This legislation fails to ensure that India does not divert its domestic supply of enriched uranium to its weapons program, nor does it place India's military facilities under IAEA inspections, all regrettable. In addition, despite the fact that the five current nuclear weapons states are believed to have suspended the production of fissile material, this proposed agreement does not force India to do the same and operate under these same guidelines.

I am extremely disturbed by recent media reports, however, that the Administration was aware of two Indian firms that had sold missile parts to Iran, but failed to inform Congress prior to this bill being debated before us. The fact that the Administration failed to present to Congress on July 1 a mandated report regarding weapons suppliers to Iran and Syria, is a case of neglect, but the timing of this severe neglect of duty could not have been worse. The Administration, despite its assertions that India has an impeccable nonproliferation record, has deemed it proper to sanction the two companies, but did not feel that it would be prudent for Congress to know this information prior to this vote. This oversight demonstrates a serious lack of judgment on the part of the Administration, and calls into question all given assurances of security safeguards on the proposed nuclear deal. Had this information been available prior to this debate, I believe it would have greatly influenced not only the content of the legislation before us, but the outcome of the vote we are about to take.

I voted in favor of this legislation in Committee, and intend to support, this legislation now, in the hopes that the Administration would continue working to obtain assurances from the Indian government that there will be no transfer of nuclear technology, either deliberate or accidental, to either the Indian weapons program, or to rogue regimes who are attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction. I strongly urge the Administration to urge that all Indian facilities be placed under IAEA inspections, and that the Indian government voluntarily halt the production of fissile material.

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this infor-

mation, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, August 3, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.